



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/932,408 08/18/2001		08/18/2001	Russell Dickerson	35997-217836	4316	
26694	7590	08/24/2005		EXAMINER		
VENABLE LLP				CHAI, LONGBIT		
P.O. BOX 34385 WASHINGTON, DC 20045-9998		20045-9998		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
				2131		

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/932,408	DICKERSON ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Longbit Chai	2131		

Before the Filling of all Appear Brief	Examiner	Art Unit							
	Longbit Chai	2131							
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the d	orrespondence add	ress						
THE REPLY FILED 10 August 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.									
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or o this application, applicant must timely file one of the follo places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a N (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in comp following time periods:</li> </ol>	owing replies: (1) an amendment, a otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	ffidavit, or other evide compliance with 37 (	ence, which CFR 41.31; or						
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of	f the final rejection.								
The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.									
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).								
extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have een filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) bove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any arned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL									
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com	pliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	e filed within two mon	ths of the date						
of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.  Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).									
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>									
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);									
<ul> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</li> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</li> </ul>									
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a))		jected claims.							
<del></del> ·	4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).								
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a		, timely filed amendn	nent canceling						
the non-allowable claim(s).  7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:									
Claim(s) allowed:									
Claim(s) objected to:									
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-24</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:									
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE									
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>									
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to</li> </ol>	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a						
showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessa	-	• •	•						
10.  ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.  REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER									
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered be <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	ut does NOT place the application	n condition for allowa	ance because:						
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)  13. Other:	. (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s).							
	P.	many Exam. fuzisi	ner						
	f	122125							

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

- 1. Regarding applicant's remarks, in claim 24, applicant argues Nasu does not teach "an AND gate having a first input connected to the control line, a second input connected to the data output line, and an output connected to an input of a buffer". However, Nasu teaches an AND gate having a first input connected to the control line, a second input connected to the data output line, and an output connected to an input of a buffer (Nasu: see for example, Column 9 Line 16 22, Figure 10A and Figure 12A). Examiner notes the actual implementation of a AND gate in the semiconductor industry is carried out by using a NAND gate combined with an inverter. The inverter can also provide sourcing capability (i.e. buffering function).
- 2. Applicant argues Nasu as modified does not teach the microprocessor core generates microprocessor signals for decoding by the decoder. Examiner notes Nasu as modified discloses the microprocessor core generates microprocessor signals for decoding by the decoder (AAP: see for example, Paragraph [0030] 1st 5th sentences) & (Nasu: see for example, Column 1 Line 55 57, Figure 14 / D4, Column 10 Line 28 31, Column 9 Line 57 59 and Column 10 Line 49 52).
- 3. The entry of the dependent claims 10, 17 and 18 would alter the scope of the original independent claims 1 and 13. This would result in changing ground of rejection for the entire group of claims associated with its independent claim and thereby would require reopening of prosecution for further reconsideration.